

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/002,000 Examiner Vincent P. Barth	CHEN ET AL. Art Unit 2877	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(1) Vincent P. Barth, Examiner.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Susanne M. Hopkins, Atty. for Applicants.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 13 January 2004

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:**  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

*Claim 19*

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Barth telephoned Attorney Hopkins to discuss the Remarks in the Amendment dated 25 November 2003 at page 12, first paragraph, in which Claim 19 was characterized as describing light which passes only through the notch on a wafer. Since Claim 19 did not contain the term "only", the Examiner wished to determine whether this was merely a typographical error, and thus whether the claim language should prevail. Attorney Hopkins determined that the claim language was as intended, thus Applicants did not wish to amend the claims.